THEOLOGY

VOL. LVIII JUNE, 1955 No. 420

Editorial

Baptism and Confirmation To-day,[1] the Final Report (strictly speaking, "the Schedule attached to the Final Reports") of the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York that have been working on the subject for many years, is remarkable for the fact that the minority produces a longer report than the majority. The minority consisted of three members out of a total of twenty-nine, and so must be deemed to have been generously treated. We doubt if the extension of so much indulgence to a minority would form a good precedent, but in the present case it has its advantages.

The earlier, provisional reports of the Joint Committees, namely *Confirmation To-day* (1944) and *Baptism To-day* (1949), have been much discussed, particularly by the clergy in ruridecanal chapters, and the results of these discussions are collated in the present report. It is apparent that, however extensive the uneasiness of mind among the clergy concerning the administration of the rites of Christian initiation, none of the radical policies or drastic changes, that have of late years been canvassed or proposed, carries that degree of conviction or commands that degree of support that should be a precondition of its formal or canonical adoption.

The practical recommendations of the majority are consequently of a moderate and even tentative kind, e.g. "Every effort should be made to see that at least one godparent is a communicant of the Church of England". If the recommendations are caried out, it may be hoped that they will lead to considerable improvement without causing any considerable disturbance. It is difficult however to feel much enthusiasm for what ought already to be the commonplace proceedings of any well-conducted parish, or to feel much confidence that the leakage from the Church will be largely arrested without measures more calculated to strike, and even disturb, the public imagination.

It therefore seems to us just as well that the majority report should be closely attended by a minority report which expresses dissatisfaction with both its theology and its practical recommendations wherever there are any grounds for doing so. The measures advocated by minority, though they are not of an extreme rigorism, are open to various objections. They are not likely to be adopted, at any rate under present conditions, but the statement of the case for them will prevent too much complacency with the majority recommendations, not least because the minority report which, we conjecture, is basically the product of one hand if not of one mind makes more coherent and more persuasive reading than the majority report which bears marks of compositeness.

• • • • •

[1] S.P.C.K. 5s.

Religious Education in Schools,[1] which is the report of a research committee of the Institute of Christian Education on an inquiry into the working of the 1944 Education Act, makes a reliable judgment possible about what is now actually happening in schools with regard to religious education. It is based on extensive factual investigations, and covers such matters as Agreed Syllabuses, Staffing and Specialists, Worship, and Equipment. While after only ten years there is still inevitably much variety in practice and in standards, the general picture is one for which Christians cannot fail to be thankful. It may be that, as the report says, individual clergymen may occasionally be heard "denouncing the agreed syllabus as a bloodless form of undenominationalism which cannot even by the exercise of charity be called Christian teaching". But, as the report goes on to say, "it usually transpires that they have never even opened an agreed syllabus" (p. 47). Certainly, any who study this report, not least its account of worship in schools, in conjunction with the recently published symposium by headmasters and headmistresses, *The School as a Christian Community*,[2] will be deeply impressed by the opportunities that the 1944 Act provides for an all-round and genuinely Christian education and by the way in which the opportunities are being used.

• • • • •

The Authentic New Testament,[3] "edited and translated from the Greek for the general reader" by Hugh J. Schonfield, is a finely bound and printed volume. It is said to be the first translation of the New Testament into English by a Jew. It is anyhow an entirely fresh translation: Mr Schonfield says that he has approached the N.T. documents "as if they had recently been recovered from a cave in Palestine or from beneath the sands of Egypt, and had never previously been given to the public". He has therefore in his translation avoided some of the terminology that is familiar to Christian ears (for example, "apostles" become "envoys"), but the general result will be much less surprising than he imagines to Christians who are already acquainted with modern translations of the Bible. Mr Schonfield is quite justified in claiming that his work bears no signs of a polemical purpose, and also in expressing the over modest hope that "even those who may feel that I have failed to perceive the full implications of the Christian Faith will yet discover some things of worth that are new to them and useful to them". There is nothing very radical in his critical conclusions: e.g., he says of 1 Peter that "there is a fair possibility that it was written by the Apostle from Rome about A.D. 65".

The way the book is arranged suggests that it is designed chiefly for Jews and others who have not read the New Testament before. For Christians it is a handicap that it is printed without any indication of the conventional chapter divisions or verse numberings. If

[1] National Society and S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.
[2] Edited by W. O. Lester Smith. S.C.M. Press. 4s. 6d.
[3] Dennis Dobson. 75s.

these had been given only at the top of each page, the use of the book for reference purposes and indeed by the general reader would have been facilitated. Many who could with advantage refer to Mr Schonfield's rendering of particular passages will find that he has made this as difficult as possible, since he has in addition rearranged the order of some books, e.g. the Fourth Gospel where he has also abstracted many supposed glosses from the text. We hope that these handicaps will be overcome in the new and cheaper edition that will deserve to be published in due course.

• • • • •

When Dr F. Brittain's *Latin in Church* was originally published in 1934, our predecessor in the editorial chair (who made the mistaken assumption that its author was "of the Roman obedience") said that "everyone ought to read it".[1] That was a pardonable exaggeration. It ought without question to be read by everyone who has anything to do with the pronunciation of Latin in church services, e.g. in anthems and carols. We warmly welcome the new edition of this book,[2] and trust that it will call a halt to the tendency in Anglican cathedrals and collegiate churches to introduce the Italian pronunciation with its "chees and chaws", etc. The pronunciation recommended by Dr Brittain, to which incidentally St George's Chapel, Windsor, faithfully adheres, is English consonant-sounds with Continental vowel-sounds. Among the English Roman Catholics, it appears that only the Jesuits now maintain their traditional pronunciation; all others have succumbed to Italianization. *Latin in Church* contains much curious historical information. The new edition has the full text of a French broadsheet of 1582 which has been discovered in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge.

The Historic Episcopate and After

K. M. Carey (Ed.), *The Historic Episcopate.* Dacre Press, 8s. 6d.
E. R. Fairweather, *Episcopacy Reasserted.* Mowbrays, 4s.
K. N. Ross, *The Necessity of Episcopacy.* Church Union Literature Association, 9d.
Raymond Raynes, *The Apostolic Ministry and Reunion.* Mirfield Publications, 1s. 6d.

To take up arms in a quarrel which is not one's own might seem to be courting the particular brand of trouble reserved only for fools, but the essays entitled *The Historic Episcopace* written by seven friends from Westcott House, Cambridge, have evoked a vigorous reaction from many quarters, some shrewd and helpful comment but much excessive and at times even unfair criticism from upholders of the *esse* theory of episcopacy.

The book itself suffers from comparison with the massive erudition

[1] *Theology*, July 1934, p. 4.
[2] Mowbrays, 8s. 6d.

of *The Apostolic Ministry* which has not itself escaped damaging criticism from many quarters. It betrays signs of haste and one at least of its contributors wrote not from the imagined leisure of an academic post but in the bustle of a busy assistant curacy. The essays may also be unequal in scale of treatment, but the thesis which the authors propound, that episcopacy is of the *plene esse* of the Church, rings true as an important contribution to the subject, and it would not be surprising if it could be supported at greater length and with stronger cogency. This, I am sure, is a position which the authors themselves would not disown. From the academic point of view alone it is difficult to account for the strength and vigour of the reaction which it has evoked. Bishop Stephen Neill, for example, in a recent article in *The Church of England Newspaper* found little in the book which was unfamiliar in the South Indian scene as long ago as 1934. But the book bore something of the character of a Tract for the Times and perhaps this fact may help to explain the storm of criticism which it has aroused in certain quarters.

The book received a somewhat lukewarm welcome from the Bishop of London in *View-Review* for May 1954. He detected a possible weakness in the attempt to rebuild the history of the Christian Ministry *ab initio* from the New Testament instead of approaching the documents from what is really the unbroken tradition of the Church. "The fact is that the only ministry of which we have certain and irrefutable evidence is the episcopal." I am sure that no Anglican, and certainly none of the Cambridge authors, would deny either the strength or the importance of argument from Tradition in support of the Historic Episcopate, but the fact is never placed in dispute in the book itself. The authors contend that one particular theory of Episcopacy (the *esse* view) fails to take account of all the facts and consequently a reappraisal of the historical evidence becomes of the utmost importance. The question which the authors propose, "Is there a sufficient weight of evidence to justify the full rigour of the *esse* view?" is a proper question which can be answered only by a review of the available evidence from the New Testament and elsewhere.

A review of the book by the Bishop of Durham appeared in *The Bishoprick* for August 1954. There is much generous recognition of the merits of individual essays and a penetrating finger placed on some of the weak places of the argument. The authors are so concerned to demolish the prepared positions of their opponents that they do not pay sufficient attention to the necessity of establishing their own. In default of this, their thesis turns out to be little more than a strengthened form of the *bene esse* theory. This criticism, which has been widely voiced, is perhaps less than just, since the significance of the new theory lies precisely in the overplus which it gives to what had previously been the usual alternative to the *esse* formula. The Bishop finds a discrepancy between the historical treatment and the high claims made for episcopacy in later essays. I think myself that the relation between the apostolic authority manifest in the New Testament and the later episcopate can be drawn somewhat

closer than Mr Vanstone imagines without any surrender to the *esse* theory which neither of us would hold. There are sufficient possibilities that for an interim period at least the apostolic authority was vested in a collegiate episcopacy to make me chary of admitting more to the supporters of the *esse* view than that Monepiscopacy represents the natural embodiment and even the normal effectual sign of this authority. The Bishop commends Mr Woolcombe's treatment of the Fathers but questions whether the precedents which he cites cover the modern situation. I don't think that Mr Woollcombe would claim that they did, but he is entirely justified in pointing out that where the healing of schism is at stake the Church was normally prepared to modify the full rigour of her rules. The Bishop contrasts the sporadic anomalies of the early Church and "those Post-Reformation systems which reject the pattern of order altogether and on the strength of other principles". But surely this is an imperfect diagnosis of the present situation where we are no longer concerned merely with Post-Reformation denials but with a new willingness to hear and (in the Church of South India) to act. But it is Mr Montefiore who draws the Bishop's heaviest fire. The discrepancy between the interpretation of "necessary" in the Rubric to the Ordinal and in Article VI is pointed out. Perhaps the remainder of each phrase should also have been quoted "necessary to the Church" and "necessary to salvation". The difference in the shade of meaning can be defended by the distinction between questions of order and matters of faith by no means unknown in early Anglican teaching. It does not look as if the advocates of the *esse* hypothesis held a monopoly of the evidence. But there are pitfalls ahead of those who try to build their theology on the basis of rubrics. While Sermons are enjoined both at the Ordination of Priests and the Consecration of Bishops, no subject is laid down for the Sermon on the latter occasion. This is a fact which I should find most embarrassing if I were an upholder of the *esse* theory of Episcopacy! The Bishop asks whence the high doctrine of Episcopacy contained on pages 117–20 is derived. In part, of course, as the footnotes show, from his own teaching. But the really important question is rather the source of the modifications which Mr Montefiore accepts, as many others do, from the teaching of Headlam and Quick. The traditional categories have shown themselves too static and unyielding to do justice to the modern situation and the "Road Home" to a fuller Unity.

Dr Fairweather has already written at greater length and with real brilliance on the whole subject. His little brochure *Episcopacy Reasserted*, described by the *Church Times* as a tract for Proctors, displays the same qualities of mind. There is much shrewd criticism, some of it wholly justified, but the assumptions underlying the essay will hardly do. The very title itself is question-begging. *Episcopacy Reasserted* is reminiscent of the fine seventeenth- and eighteenth-century style, but in fact Episcopacy has never been denied. What is denied is the necessity for one particular theory and the implication of the title is an ingenuous *pars pro toto*. The pamphlet takes the form of extended reviews of particular chapters. Dr Robinson, who

receives a "Highly Commended" from the Bishop of Durham, does not pass unscathed here. His main thesis, it will be recalled, is that we can have as high a doctrine of the Ministry as we like provided that our doctrine of the Church is still higher and that our doctrine of the Church must similarly be set under our doctrine of the Kingdom. Using the new emphasis upon eschatology of which he has made himself a master, he sends us back to consult our co-ordinates again. Dr Fairweather takes him to task for "cutting the Church loose from the Kingdom" and seeks to re-establish their inner identity. The authors "make the Church the preview of the Kingdom rather than its sacramental embodiment". In fact nothing would appear to be further from the minds of the Cambridge essayists. Dr Fairweather himself may on the other hand be accused of approximating the Church and the Kingdom in a manner to which, the Matthaean Parables notwithstanding, the New Testament is a stranger. Dr Robinson's whole essay is in part a vigorous and not unjustified protest against the setting up of false ultimates. The accusation of "this-worldly moralism" made on page 15 of the brochure will in any case hardly do, and the protest against the application of Ephesians 4. 13 to the question reads strangely in the light of the preceding verse. The many-sided thought of St Paul can hardly be tied down in so rigid a manner. On the very next page Dr Fairweather makes the astonishing statement that "to assert the fitness of the fundamental Christian institutions for their instrumental function is to grasp the true theological meaning of the Church's life and action". If this is the sole substance of his contention, few will venture to dispute with him. Might not an advocate of the *bene esse* view maintain as much?

Dr Fairweather's treatment of the evidence of the Early Church is full of interest. His quotation of Pearson to the effect that the episcopate was, as it were, included within the apostolate appears both apt and illuminating. The Apostolic authority was (and still is) the glue of the Church. But that does not really dispose of the further questions with which *The Historic Episcopate* was concerned. Its authors were after all not attacking but defending episcopacy. But I should not have expected to find Pearson's dictum regarded as in itself an adequate answer to the difficulties caused to the *esse* view by the New Testament equivalence of bishop and presbyter, for the real question at issue is the method of transmission of this authority and here the *esse* doctrine makes high and exclusive claims. Dr Fairweather rejects the conclusions of Einar Molland on the consecration of St Irenaeus by the local presbyters, though no less an authority than Duchesne was prepared to entertain it. Certainly we know of a visit paid by St Irenaeus to Rome, but this is not directly related to a consecration. How could the bishop of a large missionary diocese secure consecration before the multiplication of local sees? The pamphlet passes to the notorious crux of the Church at Alexandria. Admittedly there are other interpretations of the evidence besides that of Telfer, but his article had the great merit of suggesting an element of transmission which, if conjectural and somewhat macabre, treated seriously the absence of local suffragans until the third cen-

tury. The general character of the Alexandrine succession list before the time of Demetrius does not encourage any easy answer. Perhaps Mr Woollcombe should have given the context of a famous passage from St Jerome; he was primarily concerned with the factual information which it contained. No less important, though neglected both in the book and the pamphlet, is the probability that in the earliest times the form of the episcopate at Rome was collegiate. It is not only *pietas* for the memory of Bishop Lightfoot, after whom my chair at Durham is named, that makes me press the point. Dr Jalland, who presumably upholds the *esse* doctrine, and some Roman Catholic scholars would be prepared to accept the evidence as sufficient. The *plene esse* view can take such difficulties in its stride; it is difficult to see how the *esse* theory can be so complacent. If there have been periods, however short, and situations, however provisional, in which the Historic Episcopate was not transmitted in what might be called "rectilinear succession", the way would appear to be open for the possible transmission of apostolic authority through other channels.

Dr Fairweather recognizes truly enough (with a complimentary footnote to my colleague Canon Greenslade's work on *Schism in the Early Church*) that the distinctive position of the Anglican Church is our claim to be a true Church but not the whole Church. If the pamphlet appears to restrict this principle to the limits of Palmer's famous Branch theory of the Church, it admits of a wider application. Certainly, as the *Church Times* points out, Dr Fairweather is no uncharitable rigorist. His position with regard to the great non-episcopal communions is curiously equivocal. They might almost be described as "within, without, within the Church". Many will feel that there is a *tertium quid* between the simple equation of Catholicity either with a single communion or with a group of communions similarly structured, on the one hand, and the admission that the true Church is invisible marked by no structural notes. Even on the Branch theory something has happened to the outward unity of the Church, for the Branches are not visibly one. Their unity has at least to the ordinary eye receded into invisibility. I have never personally been able to see why this principle of schism within the Church accepted so far cannot be carried still further. No Anglican doubts that episcopacy is a degree of being a Church, but some would hold that its presence or absence is a matter of degree and not a difference of kind, and that it must be taken into relation with other degrees in assessing the claims of a Church (even our own) to be within the ambit of the Catholic Church. The visible unity of the Church has not so much receded into invisibility as been held as it were in commission between the various Churches as the result of schism. The conception maintained by Quick and implied by Montefiore seems at least more true to the facts, more empirical (to use Mr Webster's term), than the alternative Branch theory which seems to imply what is virtually an impassibilist doctrine of the Church. Other critics give a more forthright exposition of this latest assumption. Dr Fairweather's formula given at the foot of page 35 and

the top of the following page distinguishing schism within the Church (the Branches) and schism from the Church (the non-episcopal communions) with the rider that are divisions within the Body will come as a surprise to those who are accustomed to maintain that the Church is the Body of Christ. It savours a little too much of the distinction between the Church and Christendom fashionable in another place. Such theological escape clauses are a positive invitation to do our rough working again. Yet if it seems to fail of success (perhaps inevitably) his treatment of the status of non-episcopal Churches is patently honest and sincere. At the end of it we are inclined to wonder why he could not follow the lead of earlier Anglicans like Lancelot Andrewes, call them Churches, albeit defective in certain particulars, treat them as such and have done with it. If this is the kind of *distinguendum* to which the *esse* theory leads, there is good reason to prefer the *plene* view.

The allusion to Lancelot Andrewes brings us naturally to the author's reflections upon Anglican History. No one doubts the tenacity with which the Church of England retained the Historic Episcopate or would be prepared to-day to abandon it as the price for corporate Reunion. But it is quite another thing to extend this to cover the acceptance of one particular theory of episcopacy. On the subject of Post-Reformation Anglican Theology others are far better qualified to write. Dr Sykes is perfectly well able to deal with the glancing blow at his use of the theory of the "godly prince" in this connexion. It is hardly enough at a time when the influence of non-theological factors is becoming widely recognized to reply in brackets that this "theory of polity is not supported by the formularies of the Church of England", especially when Dr Fairweather is going to incorporate something very like it into his own solution on page 49. Nor is it good enough to interpret Mr Till's essay as an attempt to extract a doctrine from a series of escape clauses devised to deal with certain hard cases. As Professor Norman Sykes and Bishop Hunkin have shown, the hard cases are not as easy to handle as the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* imagined. Is it satisfactorily proven that no non-episcopally ordained minister ever possessed a cure of souls or celebrated the Sacraments or that, if they did, they lacked whatever was understood at the time by formal authorization? What is the significance of the fact that Archbishop Laud, Bramhall and the non-juror Leslie all included the Scandinavian and German Lutheran Churches as among the episcopal communions? Can the custom of communicating with the French Reformed Church by a High Churchman like Cosin, a practice which he justified under inquiry, though not followed by Morley and Hickes, be reconciled with the virtual canonization of the *esse* theory? Or how can it be harmonized with the employment without reordination of Lutheran missionaries by the S.P.G. in a later century? Could the bidding prayer include the Church of Scotland among the Churches mentioned if episcopacy were of the *esse* of the Church? Could Bishop Joseph Hall have declared "Blessed be God, there is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters

of the Reformation. We accord in every point of Christian Doctrine without the least variation. The only difference is in the form of outward administration" if the doctrine that episcopacy was of the *esse* of the Church were the acknowledged interpretation of the Rubric of the Ordinal? The clue to these difficulties seems to lie rather close to Dr Fairweather's hand in the distinction between a true Church and the whole Church. While there is in general a tough enough retention of episcopacy for ourselves, evidence of this kind suggests the recognition of the great non-episcopal communions as Churches, although defective, however excusably, in certain respects. While this is perfectly compatible with the Cambridge theory, it is difficult to see how it can be reconciled with the stricter forms of the *esse* theory. Dr Fairweather is perfectly entitled to remind us, as Dr Mason had done before him, that stricter views are also to be found among the classical Anglican divines; the existence of statements of this kind, some of which are not related to the so-called hard cases, indicate that the *esse* theory by no means holds a monopoly of the evidence and that the attempt to claim it as the historic position of the Church of England savours of innovation. It is not Dr Fairweather but Mr Carey who has a right to the statement "if the Church of England is going to abandon its own history we ought to be given the reasons".

In his final section on the case of the Reformed Church Dr Fairweather shows that he is perfectly aware of the principal evidence. Obviously both he and I and many others will make our selection and use it in the context which appears best to us. I think him minimizing in his treatment of the evidence; he would probably accuse me of overestimating its implications. But the point which I would select for emphasis is that to treat the non-episcopal Churches as defective is not to deny that they are Churches at all. Despite his courteous demurrer on page 53 the position of Bramhall cannot be far removed from that of the Cambridge Seven. If it be true that too much laxity may be as dangerous as undue rigour, the fact remains that to-day a new factor has entered into the situation, the possibility of an end to some of our unhappy divisions on the basis of the acceptance of episcopacy by those who at present do not possess it. The Reformed Catholicism for which the Church of England classically stands is not quite adequately described as "a Catholicism purified by the Reformation but not mortgaged to the Reformers". Some of us have far closer affinities to the Churches of a more radical Reformation than others. Our Church represents a stream of thought and life which alone of Christendom straddles the great divide.

Mr K. N. Ross enters the lists with a pamphlet of a different calibre entitled *The Necessity of Episcopacy*. It strives earnestly to be fair and even in some points succeeds in being generous. It recognizes that there are points of which an Anglo-Catholic may well be reminded. Like the Bishop of Durham, Mr Ross recognizes much that is good in the Church of South India, but like the Bishop of London considers that full intercommunion should be withheld until the end of the Interim period. The *plene esse* formula is treated as a slope

rather than a platform, a *via media* which quickly bifurcates into two roads labelled Catholic and Protestant respectively. If applied in other fields it might lead to some unexpected and unwelcome results. There is a touch of Mgr R. A. Knox's "Reunion all round" in parts of the pamphlet. This may be good propaganda but bad theology, for some questions are more capable of resolution in terms of "Both-And" than of "Either-Or". On strict Catholic premises no doubt Mr Ross is right in many of his criticisms, but the whole point of the Cambridge book is that these may be too static to apply to the present situation of the Reintegration of Christendom. The whole treatment is dominated, as I suppose on his premises it must be, by the Impassibilist theory of the Church. It is noticeable, for example, that Mr Ross studiously avoids calling the non-episcopal communions Churches, while admitting that their members are by Baptism incorporated into the Body of Christ. He accuses the Cambridge authors of trying to have it both ways, treating episcopacy as essential and yet not as essential to the being of the Church. Those of us who think of the difference between episcopal and non-episcopal Churches as a matter of degree rather than of kind will not be unduly worried by this logical puzzle. In fact a somewhat similar difficulty can be retorted upon the upholders of the *esse* theory of Episcopacy. Despite the protests of some of its more moderate champions, its strict consequence is to "unchurch" the non-episcopal communions and this seems contrary to any empirical assessment of the facts. In the words of Lancelot Andrewes' letter to du Moulin, "we see Churches standing without it" and the accent can be placed quite deliberately upon the word "Churches". Yet it is equally clear (though Mr Ross would on his premises be quick to rejoin Why?) that a Reunited Church would be inconceivable without the Historic Episcopate. This has already been recognized at least in principle by the Church of South India and a beginning made with putting it into effect for the future. There is even some hope that a similar situation may yet arise in this country. The Cambridge formula seems to many to provide for the Historic Episcopate as an important element of degree within the Reunited Church, a veritable treasure which some Churches can share with others without involving the unwelcome, and many would think untrue, negative implications of the *esse* theory. In the view of a Central Churchman like myself it somewhat resembles the famous advertisement for Erasmic Shaving Soap "Not too much (*esse*), not too little (*bene esse*), but just right!" No doubt from the standpoint of the *esse* view it seems to amount merely to *bene esse* double plus; this should not blind others to the significant difference involved in the "double plus". The latent assumption of the *esse* theorists is that their view is the only one which can do justice to the importance of episcopacy; it is not only the Cambridge Seven who will regard this as a fallacy. An ordinary colour may well appear to be drab in comparison with an overtone.

The pamphlet states with perfect clarity and fairness the classical Catholic doctrines of authority and validity. Given his premises Mr Ross can do nothing else. Many, however, would find them all too

static to be completely adequate to the present situation. "Valid orders mean orders guaranteed by the Church." Yes, but where is the Church? Nor can it appear completely satisfactory to be told that the "ministry is not in principle denominational" when in fact all that we know of its exercise is within single denominations. Granted that "nothing would make me more priestly than I am at present", what is the position of a non-episcopally ordained minister who might well plead the same? The legal analogy given at the foot of page 9 will hardly do as it stands. No Free Church minister acts on his own authority and the contrast between "the little group which recognizes him" and "the central authority" will hardly serve as an analogy between the non-episcopal and episcopal Communions. The application of legal ideas to the concept of Christian Ministry leaves out too much to be completely satisfactory.

Mr Ross is of course right that Catholic and Protestant wings within the Church of England are held together by the strong bond of a common ordination. I do not hold the *esse* theory; that should be plain by this time! He probably wishes that I did. But we are firmly bound together by a common ministerial authorization. Has he considered what this situation looks like from the point of view of a non-episcopally ordained Churchman? Here is an Anglican insisting upon something in his dealings with non-Anglicans which not every member of the Church of England is required to hold and Reunion tarries for the acceptance of the corollaries of a doctrine which, though widely held and strongly argued, is not *de fide* for members of the Church of England. Plainly it cannot look too good or appear too easy. But there is another ground of unity which Mr Ross appears to have overlooked. It is a gentleman's agreement (even between sinners!) not to do anything which would make the position of other members of the Church of England intolerable. On the whole Central and Evangelical Churchmen keep their side of the implied contract. Is it possible that the threat of secession and the insistence upon more than his pound of flesh on the doctrine of episcopacy may appear in quite a different light than in his deep sincerity he intends to his fellow Churchmen? He does well to remind us that there are other sections of the Church besides the non-episcopal Churches. The possibility of Reunion with either on terms which would carry the whole Church in their support seems far more remote than of reconciliation with the classical non-episcopal traditions. Must the one be delayed because the other is not yet in view? Other consciences than his own would be strained to breaking point by a project of Reunion with Rome except in the unlikely event of Rome becoming, as Archbishop Laud put it, "other than she is". We all stand firmly upon the necessity of Episcopacy (the title of the pamphlet itself!) in any steps taken towards corporate Reunion, but the attempt to pass from this to a particular theory of episcopacy seems to many of us to pass beyond the limits either of truth or of necessity.

Fr Raymond Raynes covers a wider field and without a specific reference to *The Historic Episcopate*. It is a charitable booklet written, as one would expect from its author, from a background of

deep spirituality and going as far in concession as his premises will permit. It is no discredit to him that his premises do not permit him to go further. He is, of course, right that the Apostolic Tradition is a whole containing elements of Faith, Order, and Sacraments. This is a timely warning against an undue preoccupation with one element at the expense of the others. Some of us would be prepared to strike a provisional balance between these (and other) ingredients of Apostolicity during an Interim period where there was (as in South India) a firm and declared intention to re-establish the Historic Episcopate. He makes the somewhat equivocal statement "We are told that there is a oneness in Christ which somehow is different from the unity of the Church". Few would wish to deny our spiritual unity with non-episcopal Christians; that is not in question and is in fact the spiritual fact which alone makes the quest for closer unity possible. The main theme of the Evanston Conference, "Our unity in Christ and our disunity as Christians", pressed this question upon the conscience of the whole Church. The problem is whether this unity can be called a Churchly unity or not. Experience compels some of us to answer "Yes" and to revise our doctrine of the Church accordingly. What answer Fr Raynes would give does not plainly appear and the closer he draws the unity between Christ and his Church, the more embarrassing the question is bound to become.

Fr Raynes next accumulates his authorities. Here it is worthy of notice that the only passage which expressly states that episcopacy belongs to the essence of the Church is the declaration of the Old Catholics. He wisely does not overpress this evidence, no doubt in view of what has been described as the "marginal variations" clause in the Concordat between the Old Catholics and the Church of England. That there is still some way to go before his case can be regarded as proven is suggested by a phrase taken from a series of articles in the *Church Times* of which the present pamphlet (with some revision) is based. In an article which appeared on 10 July 1953 he wrote: "As so much is said and written about the historic episcopate, the first task of Convocation should be to define what is meant by the words and what are the implications of accepting episcopacy." The point was quickly taken up by the Bishop of Derby in the correspondence columns of that journal. What is defined and what should be defined are not one thing but two. Many would agree cordially with both halves of his statement about apostolic succession, "It is easy to say (and may indeed be true) that there is no doctrine of apostolic succession. Many assume that this statement carries with it the implication that it does not matter." Might not the Historic Episcopate be in a precisely similar position, of great importance but without any precise dogmatic formulation? We should surely all agree that the attempt to persuade the non-episcopal Churches to accept episcopacy as a mere institution might reduce it to something like mumbo-jumbo. It is not wholly fair either to the intelligence of non-episcopal theologians or to the integrity of Anglicans who do not fully share Fr Raynes' convictions to say that this is likely to happen. We do not treat episcopacy as if it lacked any reasoned

meaning; all that we cannot accept is the claim that one particular doctrine offers the only interpretation fully compatible with the Anglican formularies or the sole adequate basis for our insistence upon it in Reunion discussions. The author's paraphrase of the Rubric in the Prayer Book Ordinal really will not do. It does not state that the sermon must show "how necessary *these* (his italics, not mine) are in the Church of Christ and how they are to be held in reverence and esteem". The positive statement about episcopacy drawn up by a group of priest-religious seems moderate and conciliatory as it stands, but much would depend upon the inferences which are drawn from it and in particular from the crucial sentence, "Bishops are not the sole repository of the authority which resides in the Church, but it is principally through the episcopate that the Church's authority is exercised". The relation of the centre or focus to the rest of the circle is the immediate problem which is raised in discussions with non-episcopal Churches. Some believe that in our anxiety to emphasize the centre we have tended to minimize the importance of the other concentric circles which together constitute the Church of Christ. If we are bound to emphasize the importance of the episcopate, a revaluation of our understanding of the other orders in the Church might be a major contribution which the non-episcopal communions would make to the complete pattern of Christian Ministry and thus in the Cambridge sense to the fullness of the Church. The most positive and moving part of the pamphlet is the sketch of a policy for Catholic-minded Anglicans. It contains however the somewhat surprising statement that "we are not concerned with the manner of their worship; we are concerned to know that it is done under and with episcopal authority". How near this comes to treating the episcopate as a mere institution is a matter which I must leave Fr Raynes to judge. There are certainly some matters concerning worship which even those who differ considerably from Fr Raynes would feel in conscience bound to raise with the non-episcopal Churches at the appropriate time and place.

None of the pamphlets reviewed here reveal any lack of concern for the Reunion of Christendom. The canard that Anglo-Catholics are not interested in Home Reunion is borne out neither by their spirit nor their contents. But it seems to me that they are working on too narrow a front and that their axioms based upon the classical Augustinianism seen through Tractarian spectacles fail to do justice to the situation which has arisen on both sides of a major schism. It is to be remembered that we have not passed this way before and that therefore the direction which we need may not lie wholly even within our own past. A courageous step by the Convocations with regard to the Church of South India and in discussions towards the end of Home Reunion may well be the appropriate response to the command "speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward". The policy of playing for safety is always tempting and (to borrow a somewhat unfortunate simile from *The Historic Episcopate*) the flustered old lady may find it easier to gather her skirts about her and camp in the middle of the road *ad indefinitum*, or at least until

the Interim period is ended. The hope of many of us is to see the Bridge Church of Christendom refuse the temptation to become a fortified island site and to continue to convey traffic from both the great wings of classical Christendom. The *plene, plene, tekel upharsin* of Mr Ross may be a brilliant theological caption, it is much less certain that the gloomy forebodings which inspired it are more than mere chimeras or that the case for episcopacy cannot be more effectively and certainly more intelligibly presented under the banner of *plene esse* than of a shorter but more dubious device.

H. E. W. Turner.

Light from the Modern West?

About a hundred and ten thousand persons are reported to have been present at a great rally held last summer, in connexion with the World Council of Churches, at Soldier's Field, Chicago. But when the Jehovah's Witnesses held their last World Assembly in 1953, at the Yankee Stadium, New York, the attendance was as high as a hundred and sixty-eight thousand: about eight hundred British Witnesses were present. This summer the Witnesses are holding in July another World Assembly, this time in England, at the Twickenham Rugby Union football ground. So the present is an appropriate moment to consider this movement again. The aim of this article is for the most part not to repeat, but to supplement, what Dr Horton Davies has written in the September 1943 issue of this review, and in his book *Christian Deviations*.

As is fairly well known, the Jehovah's Witnesses are the same body as the Russellites, the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, and the International Bible Students' Association. The movement originated with C. T. Russell, an American Congregationalist, at Pittsburgh in 1872: as an organized body, it dates from 1884, when Russell established the Zion's Watch Tower Society. It has always had a strongly Adventist tinge, looking for a return of Christ to the earth and an early end to the world. The Witnesses protest against the belief in eternal torment which was of course much more widely held by Christians in the nineteenth century than now: the fate of those who refuse salvation will be annihilation. On the other hand, their Christological belief is quite unorthodox—they regard Christ as a created being, even if the first such. His sacrifice excuses inherited sins only: wilful sins bring the penalty of everlasting destruction. The Watch Tower rejects the doctrine of the Trinity, as derived from Babylonian and Egyptian pagan sources. It is strongly opposed to all conceptions of evolution.

The Witnesses have a very detailed knowledge of the text of the Bible, and can always quote chapter and verse for their views, though their exegesis often seems to an outsider highly arbitrary. They are publishing a New World translation of the Bible: the translation of the *Christian Greek Scriptures* (the New Testament) was "released" in 1950: of the Old Testament, only the first eight books

have at the time of writing appeared. It is objected,[1] for example, to the American Revised Standard Version, that it purposely hid the name "Jehovah", and instead uses the indefinite term "Lord", and that this matter of the name is by no means unimportant. Moses is held to have compiled "Genesis" from eleven previously written documents: Adam doubtless wrote the first one concerning the Creation.[2]

Like Rome, and for that matter the great non-Christian religions of the East, the Witnesses possibly do not change their beliefs and practices, but they certainly do explain themselves anew. And it cannot be assumed that the movement's tenets are now precisely as they were in the days of the founder. *Studies in the Scriptures,* for example, by Russell, often regarded as the foundation-Scripture of the Witnesses, or at least as the main compendium of their doctrines, is now out of print: it is little used, and is regarded as somewhat superseded: new light, it is stated, comes all the time, and the Watch Tower is not stagnant but progressive. The following are recommended as setting forth the beliefs of the Witnesses as they are now. *Let God be true* (first edition 1946, ten million and three thousand copies: revised 1952, second edition two million): *This means Everlasting life* (1950, three and a quarter million copies): The Report of the New World Society Assembly of Jehovah's Witnesses (1953): and the 1954 Yearbook of Jehovah's Witnesses.[3] There are two fortnightly magazines, *The Watchtower,* with a circulation approaching two million and published in forty languages, and *Awake,* with a circulation of a million and a quarter, in thirteen languages: the former deals solely with the Bible, while the latter deals with topics of general interest. The Witness literature is all published by the movement itself at Brooklyn. Literature is regarded as a substitute for the oral sermon or Bible discourse that is available only to the few. Moreover, the Witnesses take this to the people, while the religious clergy require people to come to them to be preached to.[4]

The history of the movement falls into three rather distinct periods, corresponding to the three leaders. Pastor Russell was the leader till his death in 1916. He is regarded as having been above all a Bible student. At his death, the Witnesses numbered no more than about two thousand.

Russell's successor, "Judge" Rutherford, was above all a fighter. He declared that the end of the old world had now come: and caused a statement of this fact to be taken to all clergy, officials and others. There was in 1918 much division among the Witnesses, and a great "cleansing": the characteristic door-to-door "publishing" was for the

[1] *New World Society Assembly* (1953). *Report, p.* 17.
[2] *Let God be True* (1946), p. 46.
[3] A scholarly study by a detached critic, H. H. Stroup, *The Jehovah's Witnesses,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1945, is now out of print. Some details of Witness usage, as there reported for the U.S.A., are not the same as in England.
[4] *Let God be True,* pp. 224 and 222.

first time begun then, and not all approved of this new step: those who did not approve were ejected from the movement.

Rutherford died in 1942, and was succeeded by Brother N. H. Knorr, who inaugurated what is described as a period of education.

Christ is now considered to have returned invisibly, and to have established his kingdom and been enthroned, in 1914: this marks the Second Presence (Parousia). While Rutherford used to declare that "Millions now living will never die", this is now less emphasized: but it is held that some, or many, will in fact not die. The date of Armageddon, which will be no mere World War III, is uncertain, but it will anyhow not be later than 1984. At Armageddon, Christ Jesus, the leading fighter of all time, will knock out Satan:[1] Satan's organization, which includes all Churches and all governments, will be destroyed, and all unbelievers annihilated: the Theocratic Kingdom will be set up on earth, and the Millennium will begin. The earth will not come to an end: in fact it will remain for ever,[2] and after Armageddon will be restored to the conditions of Paradise. Satan will be resuscitated or loosed at the end of the Millennium, and will then be finally destroyed. After Armageddon, a hundred and fifty-four thousand believers (not, that is, all Jehovah's Witnesses), who constitute the Bride-class or Kingdom-class, will go to Heaven: the "other sheep" will attain eternal life on earth. It is not at all clear how the Bride-class are chosen: it is stated that whether a person is of the anointed body of Christ or not is a matter between him and the Lord: the test is purely subjective. The conception of natural immortality, by the way, is very definitely rejected. The Watch Tower does not, it is stated, promote sectarian dogmas.

Whatever may have been the case before, it is now held that there is no doctrine of a second chance taught in the Scriptures. Those of the dead who will be resurrected will be those who (1) never had a chance before, or (2) gained the approval of God. When St Paul explains that there will be a resurrection of "the just and the unjust", he does not refer to the wilfully wicked: these will never have a resurrection. So there is no question of a second chance.

The Witnesses are, as is well known, strongly anti-clerical. The religious clergy are regarded as false shepherds who fleece the flock: and the Scriptural "man of lawlessness" denotes the collective clergy, who court popularity and good reputation by wearing distinctive garb. Religious leaders are friends of greedy financiers and corrupt politicians. And the Churches are part of Satan's organization, and under his supervision and control. Religion is a racket. Christendom practises false religion.

The legal world-wide governing agency of Jehovah's Witnesses, whose headquarters is in Brooklyn, New York, is the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society. The membership of this body is fixed by law at between three hundred and five hundred members. At present there are 484 members of twenty-nine different nationalities and

[1] *New World Society Assembly* (1953) *Report*, p. 38.
[2] Ecclesiastes i. 4 is quoted for this.

serving in sixty-nine different countries. The members elect a Board of Directors (known as "the Anointed"), who have great and perhaps autocratic power. None of the Directors is British, and in fact they seem all to be Americans. The office has apparently no time limit, but if a Director starts going off the lines, it is said, he is ejected, since unity must be preserved in God's organization.

A local group or congregation of Witnesses is called a company, and meets in a Kingdom Hall, which may be a rented room in an office building, or a special Watch Tower building. It has as its leader a company or congregation Servant or presiding minister. Congregation Servants usually have a normal secular occupation, on which they depend for their livelihood.

A circuit consists of the congregations in an area roughly that of an English county, and is the responsibility of a Circuit Servant. The Circuit Servant gives all his time to his Watch Tower work: he goes round the companies in his area, spending a week in each place, and staying in a home.

Every Witness is considered to be a minister and ambassador of Jehovah's established Kingdom: this applies even to children. On this ground exemption is claimed for all members of the movement, as for ordinary ministers of religion, from National Service and conscription. This has inevitably caused continual difficulty with governmental authorities in many countries. Only Jehovah ordains his Witnesses. Every active and practising Witness is a "publisher" of the Truth concerning Jehovah's Kingdom. Every woman Witness is, of course, a minister. But no woman is a Circuit Servant or higher official. A woman may be a Congregation Servant (presiding minister) only temporarily, till a qualified male is available and is appointed.

"Pioneers" give a minimum of a hundred hours a month to "publishing", but usually have some other occupation. Some Pioneers are Congregation Servants. The movement sends missionaries to the countries of the Younger Churches, and they naturally are supported financially by headquarters. The Watch Tower is maintained, it is said, partly by voluntary donations, partly from profits on the sale of the movement's literature.

No roll of members is kept. But elaborate and detailed statistics are kept of the number of hours spent by each Witness in "publishing", and of the number of "back-calls", or visits paid to people who have shown interest in the Witnesses' message: the Circuit Servant will seek to arouse any Company whose service-average (publishing and so on) is below the average for the country as a whole. In 1953, there was in the United Kingdom an average of just over twenty-six thousand "publishers" or active Witnesses (a 5 per cent increase on the previous year: in 1937 the number was only five thousand), with a peak figure of just over twenty-eight thousand. In the U.S.A., the corresponding figures were 139,966 and 153,624. In the United Kingdom there were a thousand Pioneers and 729 congregations. In North America as a whole, there were 193,568 publishers, in Asia 2,620, in Africa 78,305, in Europe 174,257, in the world as a whole 510,228. Statistics are quoted for about a hundred and forty coun-

tries or areas of the world. There were in the world 14,163 congregations and 17,443 Pioneers: 72,344,728 hours were spent "publishing" and 22,990,305 "back-calls" were paid.[1]

The general attitude of the Witnesses is to be entirely neutral and aloof in regard to all world affairs: they refuse to exercise any earthly citizenship: after all, the world and all its governments are part of Satan's organization. So quite consistently, though they may seem to be pacifists, and indeed do cite the sixth commandment to support their refusal of military service, they refused to sign the Communist-inspired Stockholm Peace Appeal. They are allowed to take government employment: but they may not vote or hold office, nor of course do military service. In the United States, they will not let their children salute the national flag (a regular ceremony in American schools), holding that this ascribes salvation to the national emblem and to the nation: the Supreme Court has more than once argued this point and given different decisions. They regarded the League of Nations, and now regard the United Nations, as "the disgusting thing that causes desolation" (that is "the abomination of desolation" of Matt. 24. 15).

The Watch Tower is essentially a lay movement and of the people, and has never attached much value to formal training or education. It is, however, significantly coming to realize the need for more thorough training. And in 1943 the training Institute of Gilead was founded at South Lansing, New York: this provides a five-month training-course for Witnesses from all over the world. More and more of the Circuit Servants in England are people who have taken this course: and it is anticipated that eventually all Circuit Servants here will be graduates of Gilead.

The Witnesses are strongly opposed to co-operation among Christians, or what they call Inter-Faith. The Pope is denounced for allowing Roman Catholics in some circumstances to join with other Christians in prayer. Inter-Faith is said to have been pressed on the early Christians by the Roman Empire, and was by them resisted unto death. A hundred and thirty thousand Witnesses at the World Assembly in 1953 gave tremendous applause to the statement that they were glad they did not belong to the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.[2] It is wrong to mix truth and error: and Rev. 3. 15 ("I would thou wert cold or hot") is quoted against Inter-Faith.

Each congregation of Witnesses hold five different meetings each week. Three of these are held on weekdays. The Theocratic ministry school at present consists of reading the Bible right through and studying it analytically: the readers and commentators are, it is said, counselled on their presentations. The service meeting consists of a consideration of the Witnesses' field ministry, the various features of the preaching work and how to improve them. The book study meeting is held in smaller "service centres", usually in the home of one of

[1] Cf. 1954 *Yearbook of Jehovah's Witnesses*, pp. 32 ff., and *New World Society Assembly (1953) Report*, p. 83.

[2] *New World Society Assembly* (1953) *Report*, p. 18.

the brothers where ten to fifteen can conveniently meet: the Bible is here studied on the basis of one of the Society's books. On Sunday afternoon or evening there is a public meeting, with an hour-long sermon on some Bible topic.

Lastly, there is the Watch Tower study meeting: this is usually held on Sundays at 6.30 p.m., and perhaps corresponds most closely to the service of an ordinary Christian congregation. Hymns are sung from a hymn-book, *Songs to Jehovah's Praise*, published in the U.S.A., containing ninety-one hymns, all presumably original. One of them begins "Forward, Theocratic warriors", but seems to be "Onward, Christian soldiers" with only a few verbal changes. "Theocratic" or "Theocracy" occurs three times in the titles of ninety-one hymns. Prayer is offered to Jehovah: He is always addressed as "You", not "Thou" or "Thee". The bulk of the meeting takes the form of a group discussion, paragraph by paragraph, of an article in the current issue of the *Watchtower*. A footnote to each paragraph of the article asks a question: this question is read out by the chairman. If there is after a pause no answer by anyone in the congregation, the paragraph in the text is at once read out. But usually two, three or even more answer the question in a few simple sentences. And then the chairman calls on, it may be a boy of about sixteen or a youngish man, who is on the platform with the chairman, to read out the text. Most of what is said seems to be vague, quite uncontroversial, very simple and even naïve. It seems to be expected, or at least desired, that every Witness present will say something. If the congregation has recently been visited by the Circuit Servant, the chairman may have a report to read from him, perhaps expressing the hope that plans will be made quickly, if this has not been done already, to carry out his suggestions. There are no collections: and indeed the Church is continually criticized for having collections at services, for holding money-raising bazaars, and so on: but there will probably be a box by the door inviting contributions for the Kingdom work. Those who attend Watch Tower meetings seem to be a relatively young group: very few of them are old.

A good deal of the special terminology at least of the Watch Tower seems to be based on little more than a desire to be different from other people. And Jesus, it is said, was put to death not on a Cross but on a simple upright stake.[1] Again, one cannot but be surprised at the detailed knowledge claimed by the Witnesses, for example that Jesus was born about October 1 in 2 B.C.

The Watch Tower have a reputation for sharp-tongued aggressiveness and censoriousness. There are, however, some signs recently which suggest that this attitude is being modified. The 1953 Assembly at the Yankee Stadium included one session which consisted of a series of addresses on "Your ministerial manners" by "mature and experienced ministers". Witnesses have also been urged not to scold those who do not welcome their house-to-house publishing with the remark "You're going to die at Armageddon".[2] The present writer

[1] *Make sure of all things*, pp. 83 ff.
[2] *1954 Yearbook of Jehovah's Witnesses*, p. 25.

has found officials of the Watch Tower most courteous and willing to give information and answer questions.

The Witnesses on the one hand represent just that otherworldliness and complete despair in regard to the world which Communists most bitterly oppose. On the other hand, in much they closely resemble the Communists—for example, their blind and unquestioning loyalty to their group and its leaders, the singleminded and even fanatical devotion to the Cause, their monolithic and centralized organization, their antagonism to all outside the group, their party-line, which may be suddenly switched: while their group instruction, in the form of group discussion to which all should contribute, but whose conclusion is determined beforehand, reminds the present writer of the technique which he saw commonly used in Communist China.

Normally the rise of some heretical or at least schismatic sect calls attention to some truth or some practice which the Church has neglected, and which others in reaction come to exaggerate. It is, however, very difficult to point to anything very definite in the Watch Tower which is obviously sound but is lacking in the Church. Probably to most Churchpeople there is less that attracts in the Watch Tower than in such other rival faiths from the New World as Spiritualism or Christian Science or Theosophy. And yet it would be fatal just to dismiss the movement in an offhand and cavalier fashion. We must ask ourselves once and again why it is that the Jehovah's Witnesses attract, as they do, considerable numbers, especially of youth.

It seems that the strange, the new, and the queer, while they may repel some people, do in fact of their very nature attract not a few people, at least when they are held, as so often they are held, with passionate enthusiasm, not to say fanaticism. Sometimes it seems mainly a matter of chance what new sensation catches on and what does not. Certainly what catches on is not always the highest and the best. Perhaps the Watch Tower owes something to its business efficiency. Perhaps its rise has been helped by the Church's partial neglect of eschatology and the Christian hope for the consummation of God's Kingdom. There is always something exhilarating about belonging to a new and wholehearted and widespread minority movement. Certainly the Watch Tower owes much to the burning devotion of its adherents, and their knowledge, according to their own lights, of what they stand for.

Above all, in the first place the Watch Tower is essentially a movement of the people. Whereas the other great rival faiths attract many of the more sophisticated, it may be doubted whether the Witnesses include any of these. It uses simple and untechnical language (at least with some exceptions), the language of the market-place and the popular Press, and takes its illustrations from everyday modern life. Of set purpose its literature appeals to curiosity and emotion.

And again, while it is in general far more centralized than the Church, the Watch Tower does in its own way give significance to the ordinary person without too much formal education. In Church

as in State, increasing centralization is made possible and indeed encouraged by modern technology: more and more responsibility is concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. The Church accordingly must be ever more careful to allow significance to the human person as such, and to the ordinary Churchman, if it is not to find more and more of its people lapsing to strange sects which will, even if perhaps in bizarre ways, give them significance.

Anyhow, the Church's attitude to the Watch Tower, as to Marxist Communism, can only be, not chiefly censorious denunciation or blank and negative opposition, but an understanding of the causes which prompt it and the needs which partially at least it seems to meet, and a presentation and practice of the whole and authentic Christian Faith.

G. F. S. Gray.

* What may be described as the Witnesses' latest party-line may be seen in the pamphlet "Christendom or Christianity—which is the light of the world?". This was read as a lecture or sermon on the Sunday before Easter at fourteen thousand congregations of Jehovah's Witnesses throughout the world, and fifteen and a half million copies of it were printed. All but a small part of it is devoted to the usual wholesale criticism of the established Christian Communions as mercenary, unspiritual and corrupted with pagan ideas: very little space is given to the Witnesses' own positive beliefs. Incidentally, the Witnesses do not keep Christmas, Good Friday or Easter, regarding them as of pagan origin and unbiblical. But on Maundy Thursday they have a memorial of "Jesus' Evening Meal".

Places of Worship

The Cambridge contribution to the Church Revival of the nineteenth century was characteristically practical. Oxford, it may be said, worked out the theory: Cambridge applied itself to practice. While Oxford was producing "tracts" which were really treatises, a group of Cambridge men, under the leadership of that extraordinarily versatile scholar J. M. Neale, formed themselves into the Camden Society in 1839. The object of this association was "the study of ecclesiastical architecture and the restoration of mutilated architectural remains". The name of the celebrated antiquary Camden was adopted as that of a "patron saint", as it was deliberately intended that the aim of the society should be that of study of the past rather than propaganda. The movement aroused quite astonishing enthusiasm. Members set to work to visit ancient buildings, make sketches, rub brasses and gather information, which information they proceeded to disseminate in the publication known as *The Ecclesiologist*. They had an exceptionally fine field for their observations, as East Anglia abounds in magnificent parish churches (as described in Prof. Pevsner's recent work on Cambridgeshire buildings). Soon *The Ecclesiologist* began to make a stir. It was trenchantly written and, like the "Tracts for the Times" burst upon the

Church with all the force of novelty. "Old ideas which were thought to be exploded were found to be still exploding" and soon the startling principles of worship which emerged from the harmless pursuit of sketching ancient buildings were forced upon the attention of churchmen, architects and the general public.

Doubtless, these principles were often mixed with much that was fanciful. Neale and his collaborator Benjamin Webb were obsessed by Symbolism: they had translated Durandus' *Rationale* which provided a mine of symbolic interpretation, and they delighted to see in a church the representation of the Trinity in its three divisions of nave and two aisles, or the Crucifixion symbolized by the transepts, or the inclination of the Saviour's head on the Cross, as typified by the slant occasionally to be met with, in the chancel.

These and other fanciful ideas marred their work and brought the Camdenians a certain amount of ridicule. But on the whole their approach to the subject was strictly scientific and rightly "functional". They did not devise new forms out of their inner consciousness but faithfully, perhaps too faithfully, copied the original patterns. They were "functional" too, in the sense that they realized that the Church was a "place of worship", and its structure and adornment must subserve that function.

Yet the results were disappointing. England became covered with "Camden Society" churches: in towns new churches were built to meet the needs of growing populations; in the country they were ruthlessly restored in accordance with the most "correct" principles.

The main criticisms of these edifices are two: first, that they are lifeless, and second, that they are usually country churches transplanted to the town. Thus Ferrey's churches, of which the best is probably St Stephen's, Westminster, have little originality, but they are pleasing and unpretentious. Salvin, whose main interest was military architecture and fortification, built similarly conventional churches, of which St Stephen's, Shepherds Bush, is a good example, with an elegant spire, now, alas! truncated owing to war damage.

Gilbert Scott carried the conventional Gothic a stage further. One of his earliest churches, St Matthew's, City Road, now pulled down, was a reduced copy of St Mary's, Stamford. It was a country church which had wandered into the city and never looked at home there.

These churches had nearly every kind of inconvenience: they had long chancels and small side chapels into which the organ was squeezed. They had choir stalls which filled up the chancel and turned the choristers into a semblance of the medieval "lay clerks". There was much pretentious ornament, and far too many finials and crockets. Crosses and sacred monograms were introduced everywhere, ornament was restless and fussy, and altars were often raised to a disproportionate height on numbers of steps. Worst of all were the stained glass windows which were acclaimed because they shed a "dim religious light". Encaustic tiles of no artistic merit displayed shiny surfaces which competed with the glitter of eagle lecterns and brass vases and unnecessary standard candlesticks.

But the convention had come to stay. The popular idea of a church

interior as depicted on a conventional Christmas card is that of a Camden Society church.

It is not always wise to flout the conventions of the man in the pew. His idea of a "worshipful" church is what the architects of 1845 to 1875 made it. They moulded ecclesiastical taste, and though many of the lifeless churches then built seemed to have "nothing to say" they have certain values which we are in danger of losing. A typical "period piece" was Holy Trinity, Vauxhall Bridge Road, which was one of Pearson's earliest churches. It was cruciform and had a fine tower and spire. It was in the "correct" style: the Ecclesiologists considered the "decorated" as the acme of Gothic perfection, only tolerating Early English. It was pleasantly situated in a square with a garden, and within it was sumptuously furnished in accordance with the taste of the period. But it was cramped and dark and presented a marked contrast to the same architect's more developed style as exhibited in St Peter's, Vauxhall, a few minutes' walk from it on the Surrey side of the river.

Architects are often apt to be intemperate in expression. A distinguished architect has remarked "for fifty years almost every new Anglican church was built according to their [the Ecclesiologists'] instructions, that is to say, in a manner opposed to utility, economy, and good sense".[1]

Contemplation of some of the modern designs, as shown in "Fifty-two Modern Churches", makes us wonder if there is not more to be said for the "Camden" ideal than present-day fashions would allow. "A modernistic church", says Mr John Betjeman, "is often unusual but is not truly modern, and its effect is obtained by mouldings and shapes and colours which are the result of indigestion after a visit to Stockholm Town Hall."[2] And Sir J. N. Comper in his treatise on the *Atmosphere of the Church* has added his protest against the type of church which is scornful of tradition and expresses merely the self-satisfaction which has produced it and the desire to save money and avoid sacrifice. He does not, indeed, praise the Victorian Gothic buildings, but it is possible that these can be so altered as to bring out their beauties and neutralize to some extent their defects. As Sir J. N. Comper contends,[3] the altar need not be shut away at the end of a long narrow chancel: the open altar in the midst of the worshippers is his ideal, and it can sometimes be achieved, as at Eltham Parish Church or St Catherine's, Hatcham, by treating the chancel as a Lady chapel and bringing the main altar out under the chancel arch or in front of the screen with which so many "Camden" churches were furnished.

To cover England with the type of church we have been considering, inconvenient, dark, draughty, restless, and often dull, was an achievement. Pugin, whose writings had more influence than his designs, has been called the evil genius of the attempt. Nevertheless, these churches had a certain dignity and are, despite their limita-

[1] Clarke: *Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century*, p. 105.
[2] Quoted by Comper, *Atmosphere of the Church*, p. 19.
[3] Ibid., p. 21.

tions, "worshipful" and we believe that many will regret their disappearance, and still more will deplore their replacement by churches in the contemporary "functional" style.

MARCUS DONOVAN.

Studies in Texts

GENESIS 3. 5

As Dietrich Bonhoeffer demonstrates in his book *Ethik*,[1] almost every verse in the stories about man's origin in Genesis is pregnant with meaning. One of the most striking of these verses to which he draws attention is Gen. 3. 5, where the serpent in tempting Eve to eat the fruit says to her, *You will be like God, knowing good and evil.* Eve and of course Adam also succumb. Now, what does this knowledge of good and evil really mean? It is the result of the Fall. Is it possible that man can have gained by his disobedience of God? Hardly so, though it is often argued that this knowledge of good and evil means a moral conscience given to man by God as a kind of compensation for his loss of communion with God.[2] Yet this is hardly adequate.

You will be like God. The knowledge of good and evil is really only God's possession. That is the Biblical view. And man's knowledge should be of God only. Man in his original state, unfallen man, knows only God and does not know good and evil at all. The knowledge of good and evil is "adequate awareness of the opposites inherent in all being within the world, which means from the viewpoint of the Biblical creation-belief adequate to awareness of the opposites latent in creation".[3]

It is obvious that this knowledge can belong only to the Creator who can stand apart from the universe and survey it objectively. Man lives within the life of the universe, within creation, and so cannot comprehend good and evil as opposing tensions within creation. Thus the knowledge of good and evil which man attained at the Fall is at the same time no real knowledge of good and evil at all. "This knowledge of good and evil as the primordial possession of God and the same knowledge as the magical attainment of man are worlds apart in their nature. God knows the opposites of being which stem from his own act of creation; he encompasses them untouched by them; he is absolutely familiar with them as he is absolutely superior to them. The knowledge acquired by man is of an essentially different kind. A superior-familiar encompassing of opposites is denied to him. He knows the oppositeness of good and evil only by his situation within it; he knows it exactly within that evil at times when he happens to be there; more exactly he

---

[1] Munich, 1953. See particularly the chapter "Die Liebe Gottes und der Zerfall der Welt".

[2] Budde: *Die biblische Urgeschichte* cited by Skinner, *I.C.C.*, p. 96; Bennett, *Century Bible*, p. 95; Driver, *Westminster Comm.*, p. 56.

[3] Martin Buber: *Images of Good and Evil*, p. 19.

knows it when he recognizes a condition in which he finds himself whenever he has transgressed the command of God."[1] Man's knowledge of good and evil is then precisely negative knowledge, knowledge from a negative standpoint. He recognizes the polarity inherent in creation only because he is himself a sinner. He can recognize the good only when he finds himself in the opposite condition. He sees the good as something he has missed.

Professor Alan Richardson's comment on this text is: "It is implied that man aims at being as God in the sense of making his own good and evil, determining for himself what is good and evil, unwilling to allow God to determine what is right and wrong."[2] But nowhere is it implied in the origin stories in Genesis that man is setting up another standard of good and evil in opposition to God's, calling black white, and white black. He cannot do this because, as we have already seen, it is only through consciousness of sin that he recognizes the existence of good and evil in the universe at all. Moreover in Gen. 3. 22 *The Lord God said, Behold the man has become like one of us knowing good and evil,* it is decidedly stated that man's newly attained knowledge is a trespass on God's preserve, that it is knowledge of the same object as God's knowledge. Furthermore Professor Richardson elsewhere[3] defines knowledge of good and evil, following Hebrew thought-forms, as experience of life as distinct from academic knowledge, what in our jargon we should call existential knowledge, knowledge of the polarity inherent in creation, obtained through action. Man's knowledge is real knowledge not counterfeit, only it is purely negative in character. It is knowledge gained from the position of the sinner. Man can never attain to positive comprehensive knowledge. That is for him an impossibility.

Thus man can never be the final arbiter in matters of right and wrong. The Reformers recognized this clearly enough, though in later Protestantism it was obscured. Since he is *tota prava* his thinking powers are also vitiated. Even the Christian at best remains *simul justus et peccator.* We cannot and dare not construct a final moral code. That is why Jesus was so hard on the Pharisees, not because they were bad people. Precisely the opposite was the case. Nor because they were hypocrites—a few may have been, but not most. They were good people all right but they failed to recognize that they were limited, that precisely their knowledge of good and evil was limited. They usurped God's prerogative of deciding finally between right and wrong. That was their tragedy just as it is the tragedy of mankind that it is the best people, humanly speaking, who are often the causes of the worst disasters that befall us.

God at the centre of the universe can comprehend everything. Remember the words of the serpent, *You will be like God.* Man, when he falls, puts himself at the centre of things and so breaks the unity which fundamentally exists between himself and God on the

[1] Ibid., pp. 20—21.
[2] *Genesis I–XI.* Torch Commentaries, p. 73.
[3] Ibid., p. 64.

one hand, and himself and his fellow-men on the other. Desperately unhappy in this position, he seeks to overcome the disunity and adopts many expedients to do so. He may go off on a feverish round of pleasure-seeking, and we are all familiar with the paradox that the more we seek happiness the more does happiness elude us. The nobler soul may instead go in pursuit of Goodness, but meets another paradox with which we may not be so familiar, that the more we seek to be good the more does the good elude us. Here is what Professor Donald Baillie said about trying to mend the disunity by making ourselves good: "The whole procedure of trying to improve our own characters keeps us thinking about ourselves. It is self-centred, and self-centredness is the very thing from which we need to be saved because it is the essence of sin. That method fails because knowledge of good and evil belongs in the final run only to God, and failure brings discouragement or moral paralysis. Or if we think we are succeeding, then we begin to congratulate ourselves secretly on our achievement, which is the very worst kind of self-centredness—self-righteousness and pride. So instead of becoming saints we become Pharisees."[1]

When we encounter Jesus Christ and submit to his claims, then God is back at the centre of life and the old relations are restored (though *simul justus et peccator* must not be forgotten). There is an end of frustration and real fellowship is possible with people. The disunity is overcome. We need no longer try our hardest to be good, for we do good works but all unconsciously. That is the Christian type of goodness, not sought-for self-conscious goodness. The first results from God's act of justification and allows development of real character. The second is our own act and results in stunted character and impoverished social relations. As Christians we are like those men in the Gospel parable[2] who at the Last Judgment when rewarded by the Judge disclaim all merit. They could not accept a reward they had not earned. They were not only transparently honest; they were also transparently good, only they did not know it.

T. A. Smith.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. H. E. W. Turner is Lightfoot Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham and a Canon Residentiary of Durham Cathedral.

The Rev. G. F. S. Gray is a Fellow of St Augustine's College, Canterbury.

The Rev. Marcus Donovan is Vicar of Benhilton, Surrey.

The Rev. T. A. Smith is Assistant Curate of Newcastle, co. Down.

---

[1] *God was in Christ*, pp. 205—6.
[2] Matt. 25. 37—40.

CORRESPONDENCE

"TOWARDS A NEW APOLOGETIC"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I have read THEOLOGY regularly since I was an undergraduate and I think it has never published anything so misleading and irresponsible as the American Letter in your April issue. It tells us that Dr William G. Pollard's pamphlet *The Cosmic Drama* "should create an unprecedented degree of excitement on both sides of the Atlantic". It is to be hoped, for their reputation, that this will prove to be no more true of theologians on the Western than it will be on the Eastern side.

Except for its last five pages (which would be equally relevant to *any* comparable theory) this pamphlet is an exposition of a scientific theory of the origin of the physical universe. This, we read, was "a vast cloud of particles called neutrons at an enormously high temperature" and that in "a little over two minutes after the beginning, the universal expansion would have lowered the temperature to about one and a third billion degrees centigrade". The story outlines evolution from that beginning. Mr Montizambert imagines it to be "the first primary contribution to the apologetics of theism in many years", rendering obsolete apologetic studies from A. B. Bruce to Alan Richardson because it lifts us "out of the variable world of dialectic . . . into a realm of indisputable fact".

Assuming that Dr Pollard's scientific theory is the truth, its theological significance is negligible. Mr Montizambert describes him as one "who has suddenly discovered that the results of contemporary nuclear studies are incapable of other than a theological interpretation. Otherwise we live in a universe at once meaningless and futile." So far as the theory goes, it is more likely to produce an impression in favour of the second of these propositions than of the former of them, as comparable theories have in fact done; but it would be an *impression*, not a reasoned conviction.

There can be no conceivable *knowledge* or even evidence that there was *nothing*, or only God, before this alleged origination of neutrons, which cannot prove Divine creation. Indeed, the phrase "creation out of nothing" conveys no *positive* idea or information: its usefulness is the negative one of denying other speculations held to be religiously or theologically unsound. That God created a vast cloud of neutrons which two minutes later produced a temperature of over a billion degrees centigrade, either out of nothing or out of himself, is no more intelligible to the human mind than any other words about absolute origination. Mr Montizambert's one restraint is that he does not claim this alleged creation to confirm the statement in *Hebrews* that our God is a consuming fire! "We have moved out of faith, or speculation, into certainty", says Mr Montizambert. One may marvel at a religious "faith" which so un-

critically grasps at any straw which reduces faith to a prudential acceptance of the demonstrable. But in this case the alleged certainty is theologically irrelevant. His rhapsodies are unfair to Dr Pollard, of whose pamphlet he says nothing more true than that he "does but ill justice" to it; for he can quote Dr Pollard's own words that "creation as such is not a possible object of scientific enquiry or demonstration" while writing as if it were not so. *The Cosmic Drama* states quite frankly that "no empirical evidence can ever be obtained which it would be possible to use in such a way that a given event could be shown scientifically to involve a creative act", and that "the first life . . . developed in some way which we do not understand"; and that man is, as he always has been, faced with the choice between what he calls the secularist and the Judeo-Christian ways of viewing the cosmic drama.

"The grand saga of Genesis . . . fits so readily into the pattern of Creation spelled out by the new discovery", says Mr Montizambert. Also, "Genesis is in fashion again. That which was 'without form and void' abruptly came into existence." Genesis says nothing of the kind; is speaks not of absolute origination but relates the fashioning of an orderly world out of a pre-existing watery chaos, as to the origin of which it says nothing. The picture as sketched in *The Cosmic Drama* has no more resemblance to the Genesis story than it was remotely dreamt of by the framers of the original myth or by those who purified it into its present form.

The author of the American Letter makes the common and apologetically disastrous error of exalting the limits of scientific method into a proof of Divine activity To the philosophical form of the cosmological argument, the only form in which it is relevant, it makes no difference whether the physical universe had, or had not, a beginning in time, as Aquinas noted when he separated it from any particular scientific proposition about the nature of the physical universe. An eternal physical system would still be, for human thought, a *contingent* physical system. If the picture of *The Cosmic Drama*, of that of Mr Fred Hoyle, or of any similar scientific theory, should prove to be correct, only the *minor* premise of the cosmological argument (that the physical universe is a contingent existence) will be confirmed. That is all; and it is a wholly secondary contribution to whatever validity the cosmological argument may be deemed to possess. No such scientific hypothesis can prove that the universe, if it had a beginning in time, *necessarily* points to a Divine Creator transcending time and the physical universe.

As I am writing, may I also correct an error in Dr Pittenger's letter in the same issue? The usually vigilant editorial eye overlooked that in a short list of great names in Anglican thought Dr Tennant is mentioned twice and included among the departed. He is, happily, still living in Cambridge and well able to discuss the collection of papers of his authorship, scattered in various journals, into a book.

St John's College,
Cambridge.
13 *April* 1955.

Yours faithfully,
J. S. Bezzant.

[We are ourselves without excuse in having allowed Dr Tennant to be described as "the late"; but Dr Pittenger may have been misled by the fact that Sir Walter Moberly, in his Riddell Lectures, published in 1951, spoke of "the late Professor F. R. Tennant".—Ed. THEOLOGY.]

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

On page 151 of the April THEOLOGY (LVIII, 418) Mr G. N. Walton accuses me of having contended in your pages that religion, philosophy, and physical science are not relevant to one another. Is it worth while reminding your readers that such was not my point? What I tried to do was to emphasize the futility of seeking to win converts from the ranks of physicists and chemists by pretending to state Christian dogmas in what is imagined to be "the language of science".

Your obedient servant,

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

RELIGION AND BEAUTY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I trust that because Mr Flint cannot find within the pages of the Old Testament a doctrine of the Holy Spirit which reveals the experience of the Early Church and the learning of the Cappadocians, he does not therefore assume that the Old Testament contains *no* doctrine of the Spirit.

The phrase "Holy Spirit" is, in fact, found at Psalm 51. 11, and Isaiah 63. 9–10; but it can be taken in the sense of God's presence with power. I include the following eighteen quotations from Athanasius' First Epistle Concerning the Holy Spirit for Mr Flint's perusal: Gen. 1. 2; 6. 3; Num. 11. 29; Judges 3. 10; 11. 29; 12. 24–5; 15. 14; Psalm 51. 11; 143. 10; Isa. 61. 1; 30. 1; 59. 21; 63. 9–10; Ezek. 11. 24; Mic. 2. 7; Joel 2. 28; Zech. 1. 6; 7. 12. I think an examination of these and other passages in the Hebrew Scriptures—always bearing in mind Athanasius' warning on Amos 4. 13, that not in every case in which we see "spirit" written should we assume that what is meant is God's Spirit—will reveal a doctrine of the Spirit as God's presence with power. If this assumption is right, then Exodus 31. 2–3 seems to me to reveal a similar idea, and Bishop Barkway is correct in attributing Bezaleel's skill to the Holy Spirit.

Whilst your correspondent would perhaps still wish to maintain that the phrase "the Holy Spirit" is nowhere to be found within the Old Testament, it seems quite clear that within its pages are to be discovered implicit references to the Spirit—conceived of as God's presence with power, and I think Exodus 31. 2–3 is one of these.

Yours faithfully,

P. E. HANCOCK.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE,
BIRMINGHAM.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. Edited by G. W. H. Lampe. Mowbrays. 7s. 6d.

THE PATTERN OF CHRISTIAN TRUTH. By H. E. W. Turner. Mowbrays. 42s.

"Justification by faith", your reviewer once heard a well-loved priest assure his congregation one Low Sunday morning, "justification by faith means, quite simply, that we are justified in believing the Christian faith." If the explanation was singular, the underlying neglect of the doctrine is widespread. "A most wholesome doctrine and full of comfort", so Article XI; "Magister et princeps doctrinarum", after Luther; "our deepest difference" between Catholics and Protestants, according to the World Council of Churches; so fundamental a theme is ripe for re-examination. The five short papers collected in the booklet under review are simple, clear and stimulating. The result of a conference between representatives of C.R. and E.F.T.L., they make a real contribution towards the theological recovery of the doctrine and its contemporary expression.

The Rev. F. J. Taylor sets the scene well in an introductory paper and explains why Anglicans have often fought shy of the doctrine in the past. Professor Lampe, with fine biblical exegesis, vindicates Adult Baptism and the Eucharist as sacraments of justification by faith. (But most of us were baptized as infants. What about that? Here Dr Lampe is reserved.) Fr Symonds gives a somewhat staccato summary of justification in the N.T. as well as a précis from Augsburg, Rome, and Canterbury. Alas, it still seems to be held that faith, for the Reformers, is a "subjective trust that the believer himself is received into God's favour", as though *The Catholicity of Protestantism* had never been written.

Fr Maycock, starting from Westcott's contention that the Incarnation was inevitable apart from the Fall, suggests that a return must be made to the purposes of Creation before the implications of Redemption can be grasped. All this is finely said and leads to a sane Christian humanism—"Whenever disinterested Charity appears, there is the way of Salvation". But when Fr Maycock ends by speaking of the restoration of a primitive endowment, may he not be in danger of putting back the clock in more ways than one?

What then is the meaning of justification by faith? Professor Dodd showed in *The Bible and the Greeks* (surprisingly neglected in this book) that justification is primarily a Hebrew idea of God's saving activity in vindicating his people through the death of Christ. Is his grace then imputed or imparted? These writers are conscious that, even when misunderstandings are removed, this is no verbal quibble. But they are not always so clear that the doctrine is neither "Catholic" nor "Protestant" but biblical: it belongs properly neither to ontology nor to ethics, but to the biblical category of dynamic relationship. Here Dr Dillistone, in an essay of unusual depth and power, signposts the way. Based on biblical imagery, and leaning

heavily on Tillich and Niebuhr, his paper makes the recovery of the doctrine immediately and drastically relevant to the tragic predicament of modern man in his relationships to himself, to society and to God.

It is perhaps odd that the phrase "justification by faith" does not once appear in *The Pattern of Christian Truth*—and that in a book which sets out to prove that the Hellenization of the Gospel did not lead to its impoverishment. Yet, to be fair, Professor Turner has written elsewhere of the patristic doctrine of redemption: in these Bampton Lectures he is concerned with the relations between orthodoxy and heresy in the early Church, with particular reference to the three principal sources of theology in Scripture, Tradition and Reason. Whatever view may be taken about the ultimate success of this enterprise, Professor Turner has, on any showing, given a quite remarkable display of erudition and encyclopedic knowledge of the Early Fathers. Beautifully produced (I have only found two minor misprints in over 500 pages), this book not only uses typically Anglican criteria but also takes its place within the great Anglican tradition of exact scholarship and patristic learning.

In the first chapter the author refutes the "classical" theory of heresy which regards it as a deviation from a fixed and unyielding deposit of faith. He spends the next lecture in a detailed criticism of modern alternatives, especially those of Harnack and Bauer. An attempt is then made to test the claim of heresy to the name of Christian by an examination of some typical examples: this is followed by a consideration of the doctrinal basis of heresy from the criteria of Scripture, Tradition, and Reason. At last the positive part of the work is reached, and in the three subsequent chapters Orthodoxy is examined in the light of these three primary sources of authority.

In a cursory review such as this, only the most general criticism can be attempted. At times the author's straining after epigram has led him into a somewhat bizarre if spirited style (e.g., p. 117). But few will wish to quarrel with his primary theme, which the author introduces, typically enough, as a mediating view cautiously expressed: "The development of Christian theology as a whole and not merely in the patristic period may perhaps better be interpreted as the interaction of fixed and flexible elements, both of which are necessary for the determination of Christian truth in the setting of a particular age." Other key ideas will likewise find a welcome; that Catholicity is much richer than any of its components; that within the Catholic Church there is a real "unity in diversity"; that Holy Scripture can be vindicated as the foundation of doctrine beyond which there can be no developments in essentials. Yet certain queries may present themselves to the reader. What *exactly* is meant by a penumbra between orthodoxy and heresy? Does not the author's striking disregard for Jewish Christianity upset the balance of his investigations? Is not Schoeps as doughty an opponent as Bauer? Has not the author's picture of early Alexandrian Christianity been affected by the recent discovery of papyri and the implications of the

Jung Codex? Is he not too unkind to the Arians with their "bloodless categories" and too indulgent to orthodox Christological theologians? Might not his outright use of Reason as a source of authority be an anachronistic forcing of their categories to ours? Does the author unwittingly present the Church's search for intellectual expression more as a puzzle and a problem than as an intellectual ferment which overflows the limits of language to express the inexpressible? There may even be deeper disagreement over the pattern of Christian truth itself. The task of theology in any age may well be thought to lie, not in the provision of answers, but in the correct formulation of problems which must ultimately be solved not by thought but by life.

The Church of England to-day indulgently tolerates heresy and regards it as less important than charity. The early Church was not so sure. To anyone seeking its significance at the deepest level, the author's cautious and qualified conclusions may well be disappointing. But the reader should not complain. If he does not find a profound interpretation of Christian theology, he has at any rate got a masterly, if massive, synopsis of much early Church history and doctrine.

HUGH MONTEFIORE.

GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

DEMYTHOLOGIZING AND HISTORY. By Friedrich Gogarten. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

Gogarten's essay was first published in Stuttgart in 1953 as *Entmythologisieurung und Kirche*. For the English version, in making which Neville Horton Smith has carried out competently a very difficult task, some changes and omissions were made by the author. For Gogarten the real point at issue in the demythologizing controversy lies in the different way in which each side interprets the word "history" or "historical" when it is claimed that Christianity is based on history or that it is an historical religion. This last phrase conceals an ambiguity, the revealing of which leads to the heart of the essay: the medieval conception of man and his destiny, that the historical process rather than the rationality of the cosmos reveals God's purpose, "allows no historical significance to precisely that which we regard as the actual historical process, namely the vital personal experiences of particular individuals in their particular characters and responsibilities" (p. 23). Coming to modern historical thought, Gogarten criticizes that kind which, applied to the New Testament, reduces the Gospel to a body of ideas; and the "official" theology of the Church which has taken over in thin disguise the metaphysical outlook of the Middle Ages and sees behind historical events a supra-historical reality. He then states and defends the way of Bultmann: while he has much to say about how to avoid the discredited subject-object way of thinking in general, the most interest-

ing part of this exposition is that which fills a gap in the debate by discussing the incarnation.

In the New Testament Jesus proclaims the Word of God, bringing salvation. In explaining how his word could be God's Word and be salvation, the late Greek metaphysical interpretation presented the secret of the relation between Jesus and God as a mystery of the unity of divine and human nature in the one person of Christ. The new method aims to preserve this as a historical secret (not of course a secret revealed *in* history but historical in the Bultmann sense): Luther in a famous hymn asserted the unity in the words, "The Son obeyed the Father". This obedience "indissolubly links the eternal and the temporal history" (p. 73).

Justice cannot be done to the argument without extended consideration (for which we have no space) of what Gogarten means by historical thinking: a few sentences must suffice. "The world has for man become his own world." Man, "by his historical decisions in politics, religion . . . gives the world the . . . form in which it makes possible for a man a life that is in accordance with his human character" (p. 26). We may permit ourselves to wonder whether Gogarten and the others of this school do justice to the doctrine of the incarnation except when they lapse into metaphysical thinking: to say that the Son obeyed the Father implies the obedience of Jesus the man in an actual historical situation, whose meaning is still important historically in the old sense; moreover, if this obedience "links the eternal and the temporal history", we may suspect here a return to metaphysics. In fact, we still need an adequate account from this school of the fact that the New Testament presents the incarnation as an entering into history in the old sense: "the word became flesh" may be myth, but it is presented as history; and the New Testament, no less than the "official theology", claims the incarnation as a fact historical not in the new sense of the demythologizing school, but in the sense in which it was—and is—commonly understood.

Robert Leaney.
Ripon Hall,
Oxford.

The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages. A study in the ideological relation of clerical to lay power. By Walter Ullmann. Methuen. 42s.

Living, as we do, in an age when a man's religious affiliations are based upon taste, tradition, conviction, or (as some would say) vocation, it is difficult to imagine a society in which faith and churchmanship were matters not of opinion but of law. In the Middle Ages a man could no more contract out of his duties as a churchman than he can to-day avoid his obligations as a citizen.

The power of the Church extended over all men and all aspects of life, and there was nothing hid from the heat thereof. This power was exercised by the *sacerdotium*, of which both the head and the symbol was the papacy. This was a power which no one, however

exalted and puissant, could defy for long. It ruled the world (or at least claimed to do so) with far more authority than any other power, since it could claim to be of divine institution and universal. Other, secular, powers might come and go—even the Roman Empire proved to be transitory—or they might exercise sway over some limited portion of the earth. The papacy was indestructible and eternal. It claimed the power to make and unmake emperors and monarchs, to enforce or dispense from any kind of oath (and the oath was the cement which bound together the feudal system) and any kind of vow, to dictate what a man should believe and do, and to regulate his life both in this world and in the next.

Such claims on the part of the spiritual power were bound to cause resentment and opposition on the part of the temporal rulers. For a time an uneasy compromise was reached on the basis of the "two swords", the spiritual and temporal, each of which had its own sphere. But even this the papacy refused, in the end, to allow. "We are taught by the words of the Gospel", said Boniface VIII in the bull *Unam Sanctam* (1302), "that in this Church and in its power there are two swords, a spiritual, that is, and a temporal. . . . *Both* are in the power of the Church, namely the spiritual and the material swords; the one indeed to be wielded *by* the Church, the other *for* the Church; the former by the priest, the latter by the hand of kings and knights, but at the will and sufferance of the priest."

This famous statement marks the highest claim ever made by the medieval papacy. It was the culmination of a long struggle whereby the papacy had grown from the leadership of a small Christian community in Rome to a position of total monarchic and hierocratic supremacy. How that great victory was won is the story so well told in this learned book. Dr Ullmann opens with a masterly introduction in which he gives an account of the teleological development of papal thought and of papal claims in the first seven centuries by such men as Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory. From then onwards, as the Empire disintegrated, the papacy took every advantage which offered itself to build up its own position. The aphorism of Hobbes that "the Papacy is not other than the Ghost of the deceased Roman Empire sitting crowned upon the grave thereof" is here abundantly justified. Dr Ullmann leads us confidently and skilfully through the labyrinth of what used to be called the "Dark Ages", but which have recently been so much illuminated by such books as this. He explains just what the relations were between the pope and Charlemagne, and shows the significance of the coronation of the new emperor and the problems of relationship to which it immediately gave rise. He deals with the writers who supported the papal claims and with the symbolism whose power the popes knew so well how to exploit. So gradually we are brought to the great struggle between Gregory VII and Henry IV, where we see the anti-hierocratic party putting out all its strength against the Hildebrandine colossus. But the papacy was far too strong for it, and in the following century the papal monarchy went from strength to strength—uniting men as they had never before been united in the cause of the Crusades, enlarging its

own curial system, making the law of the Church more effective and more inescapable, developing the *plenitudo potestatis*, building up, piece by piece, a machine which no one could resist.

Dr Ullmann writes of all this with wide learning and great skill. No one who wishes to know how the papacy "from an insignificant community in the capital of the Roman Empire . . . developed into the most influential and important governmental institution in the medieval period" can afford to neglect this masterly survey.

CHICHESTER. J. R. H. MOORMAN.

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Vol. III ("True Religion now Established"). By Philip Hughes. Hollis and Carter. 42s.

JOHN WHITGIFT AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. By Powel Mills Dawley. Charles Scribner's Sons. $3.00.

"Even the longest book must have an end", writes Fr Hughes, and so with an account of the Elizabethan Settlement and of religion during the reign of the great queen he concludes a history of the English Reformation which may not undeservedly be called monumental. Here, in this third volume, are all the features which made its two predecessors notable—distinction of style, a vast and detailed citation of authorities, much accurate and skilful use of the sources to enable them to tell their own story, and a conspicuous honesty of purpose and fairness in handling controversial evidence. The result is certainly not a text-book, but something more valuable—a thoughtful and critical study which must for a long time be indispensable to all who want to understand the history of sixteenth-century England.

Among the many matters which will prove interesting to Fr Hughes's readers are a careful revaluation of the purpose and effect of the Bull, *Regnans in excelsis*, by which Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth, and a full account of the fortunes of the Douay mission and the dissensions among the English papists at the close of the century. He also shows convincingly that the declared reason for the government's hostility to the papists (their treasonable intentions, as we had been taught to believe) was not in fact the real reason, which was simply that the State could and would tolerate the practice of no religion but that established in 1559. This is only one of the many places at which he challenges accepted interpretations, as well as the opinions of earlier historians, and we must heed his corrections, even though we may suspect that in some cases he has not said the last word.

In these pages of Fr Hughes the name of John Whitgift figures with some frequency, but in Dr Dawley's Hale Lectures for 1953 the archbishop occupies the centre of the stage. This book is a welcome addition to the lengthening list of studies of the English divines of the Reformation, and a very competent account of the life and work of one of the great architects of the *ecclesia Anglicana reformata* in the setting of the events of his own time. It is attractively yet simply

written, and well documented—and presents (as might be expected) a view of the English Reformation and of Anglicanism very different from that of the first-mentioned work.

Here we touch upon fundamentals, and reach an ultimate and, it would seem, permanent point of cleavage between the Roman and the Anglican. When all has been said (and Fr Hughes has shown us how much it is) about the controversies and the intrigues of the age we are faced with two apparently irreconcilable views. Where Fr Hughes sees only discontinuity—the rejection of the old and true religion in favour of a new and heretical system, Dr Dawley sees a real continuity with the past, both in essential faith and in practice—for there was an institutional continuity, an identity with all that had gone before, which moulded the Anglican Church and impressed upon it a distinctive character. Despite his sincere and painstaking effort to look at the events he describes both objectively and as a contemporary, Fr Hughes is naturally and understandably committed to the basic assumption that the Reformation in England was a regrettable alienation of the nation from its allegiance to the true Church—the establishment of heterodoxy, and the impoverishment of the spiritual life of the people; but the Anglican can only accept this as an *ex parte* evaluation. There can be no final and convincing defence of the legislation and the police methods by means of which the government attempted to wipe out the Romanists in the interests of the security of the Settlement of 1559, nor (as Fr Hughes clearly showed in his second volume) of the Marian persecutions; but such things as these can all too easily obscure the main issue—on what, other than *a priori* grounds, can it ultimately be denied that the Reformation in England made it possible to restore in this land a religion at once essentially catholic and authentically biblical?

Dr Dawley well expresses the Anglican challenge when he says that in the early Stuart Church there emerged ". . . a Christian tradition still recognizably in continuity with the Catholic order England had known for centuries, now enriched and widened by the religious and intellectual challenges that stretched men's minds in the Tudor Age" —and he adds: "Possibly the uniquely distinctive feature of the Reformation experience of the English Church was the achievement of a synthesis between the Christian elements in the Renaissance awakening and the truth that was preserved and transmitted through the medieval order." In writing of Bancroft's famous sermon at Paul's Cross in 1589, Fr Hughes seems to imply that now it served the purpose of their resistance to the presbyterianizers, Anglican divines were again taking up "the Catholic idea" which (it is inferred) the earlier reformers had rejected. But had not this "idea" all the time been latent? And did it not flower profusely in the distinctive learning and sanctity of the centuries which followed—in the whole ethos of Anglicanism, which has proved itself (no less than others) a true way of Christian faith and life?

To see the English Reformation as a self-contained and self-justifying (or self-condemning) movement, rather than a stage in the evolution of this way of faith and life, is to misunderstand it. For

the Anglican, it must always remain something to be affirmed, and not extenuated or forgotten; and such studies as these of Fr Hughes and Dr Dawley are to be welcomed for the light which they throw upon a significant era in the development of the Church of England.

BIRMINGHAM. SHERWIN BAILEY.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE SPLENDID BURDEN. By Margaret Stanley-Wrench. Edinburgh House Press. 5s.

Author and publisher are to be commended on this valiant effort to further the cause of sacred drama. The scene moves from Pilate's Jerusalem to Diocletian's Carthage and Malan's Africa, though each part can be performed separately. The writing has lyrical distinction, but perhaps the intensity is not yet fully dramatic. A less conventionally edifying theme might deepen this poet's undoubted powers of imaginative sympathy and doctrinal insight. It is bad for an artist to be always on the side of the angels.

WALTER ROBERTS.

ST BERNARD: ON THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. Translated and Edited by a Religious of C.S.M.V. Mowbrays. 10s. 6d.

THE INTERIOR CARMEL. By John C. H. Wu. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

THE PERFECTION OF MAN BY CHARITY. By Reginald Buckler, O.P. Blackfriars. 13s. 6d.

Although these selections from St Bernard's sermons on the Seasons and Saints' Days do not rise to the heights of mystical doctrine which we find in the corpus on the Song of Songs, yet they achieve a directness of address which those miss. It is a curious criticism of St Bernard that the less he quotes Scripture the more readable he becomes, and there is noticeably less quotation here than elsewhere. Apart from a lapse on p. 123—"my soul is troubled to mewards"—the translator has probably rendered St Bernard's thought as urgent for the contemporary church as it can be. It will be news to some that to be "gay in the ardour of living", to use one of her choicest phrases, was regarded by St Bernard as a sign of faith. There are misprints on pp. 18 and 103.

The Interior Carmel cannot be called a mature work. The exposition of the Beatitudes as illustrative of the traditional stages of the spiritual life is a little forced, and the book reads too much like a patchwork of quotations, not all of them apt or helpful. The style is didactic, repetitive, and dull, and there are some dreadful words. Yet with perseverance the reader may glean a harvest of memorable remarks, particularly on poverty and the integration of private and liturgical prayer. There are misprints on pp. 136, 194, and 247.

The same repetition and overloading with quotation disfigure Fr Buckler's abler work on Charity, and it is not until the chapter on prayer halfway through the book that his words take wings and compel attention, though beyond this point, despite somewhat turgid rhetoric, he is well worth pursuing. There is some bad theology in his remarks on loving one's neighbour, and there are misprints on pp. 120, 134, 192, 220, and 229.

CHEADLE HULME. J. K. BYROM.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING. By J. R. R. Tolkien. George Allen and Unwin. 21s.

This is the story of how the Shire was invaded by the dark powers of the Ring, and how Bilbo Baggins disappeared, and how Frodo resisted the enslavement of his mind and nature by the Dark Lord, and how Gandalf the wizard saw him through his adventures. Add the fact that Baggins and Frodo are Hobbits (somewhere between elf and man) and you have the bones of this curiously top-heavy story.

Mr Tolkien has written a long, pedestrian fairy-story for adults, and in so doing has spoiled a perfectly good plot. There are two things wrong with this book, and unfortunately, because they are central, the whole book fails.

The first thing is Mr Tolkien's obsession with detail. He has a quite extraordinary imagination but he has not learned how to use it effectively. He concentrates on details of places and names (and even draws maps to help us out). And it is almost impossible to extricate the essential movement of the story from the morass of words in which it has bogged down. Mr Tolkien is not a writer of heroic romances. He has neither the style nor the discipline for it.

The second is, there is no answer to the question, what is the meaning of all this? Obviously Mr Tolkien wants to tell us something, and I think it likely that what he wants to say is deep and worth hearing. The only trouble is, he doesn't tell us. To read this book is like walking through an immense factory full of the most complicated and unfamiliar machinery, only to be told after hours of struggling to understand a mass of details that the owners of the factory have not been able to make the machinery produce anything yet. And this is a disappointing experience.

Perhaps the basic fault lies in the medium. Perhaps Mr Tolkien's elaborate little world cannot be convincingly described in prose. Perhaps it needs a poet. Certainly the rhymes and Hobbit songs with which Mr Tolkien all too seldom refreshes us on our way are delightful. But they serve only to point the plain ordinariness of the dialogue and the wordiness of his descriptive passages.

Inventing a new world and putting in it a new kind of creature is all very well. It is what we would all like to do very often, both in fiction and in real life. But Mr Tolkien cannot expect us to live in his world with sympathy or enjoyment unless he gives us a much

more cogent idea of why we are there and what the result of our being there is likely to be. Is this an allegory of contemporary society? Or is it perhaps a piece of religious mythology? Only Mr Tolkien knows the answers here. And, in this book at least, he seems unable to communicate them to us.

Even if you are Irish I doubt if your sense of the fey will carry you through so many pages of small talk and muddle.

STUART B. JACKMAN.

PRETORIA.

THE WORD OF GOD IN THE LIFE OF MAN. Study schemes and sermon courses prepared for the dioceses of London, Southwark, Chelmsford, Chichester, and St Albans. Mowbray. 9s. 6d.

THE ONLY HOPE OF THE WORLD. Broadcast Talks. Mowbray. 5s.

When a book comes from the new clergy centre at St Mary Pattens, London, and bears the recommendation of five diocesan bishops, we naturally expect a significant contribution to the problem of twentieth-century preaching. In fact we are disappointed. The original feature of this volume is the relation between the study outlines and the subsequent sermons. For each period of the Church's year from Advent to Trinity there is a well-thought-out scheme of subjects, outline sermons and sections headed "Basic Reading" and "Further Reading". In this material clergy and lay readers will find much help and stimulus.

It is when we come to the sermons themselves that we are disappointed. The problem of communication in our age has clearly not been faced; these sermons contain much of the weaknesses of modern Anglican preaching: a theoretical tone, an absence of warmth, failure to appeal to the imagination (the texts of only three out of twenty-five of these sermons relate to Bible stories), paucity of illustration and everyday examples, and inability to talk about things in which people are genuinely interested. Sermons that are recommended to the clergy should at least observe the elementary educational principle of proceeding from the known to the unknown. This is how one of the sermons begins:

> "We come now to the last of the three main characteristics of the Christian Road which we have to consider. It is the Road of Humility. The Greek word translated 'humility' in to-day's Epistle has undergone a transformation in the New Testament. In classical Greek, this word, and its cognates, never has a good meaning, and usually one which is definitely bad. In the N.T. 'tapeinophrosune', humility, has been exalted to the rank of a great virtue. Indeed, it is not going too far to say that it is the hall-mark of the Christian character. Dr E. G. Selwyn, the Dean of Winchester, says, 'The Christian use of the word is one of the plainest examples of the transvaluation of values achieved by Christianity.'"

Why should we assume that the man-in-the-pew is interested in the etymological problems of the New Testament? Such a beginning would clearly lose the sympathy of the average congregation, and afterwards it would not matter very much what was said, as attention would have been lost.

The Only Hope of the World is a series of sermons broadcast last year in the People's Service on Sunday mornings in the Light Programme. Each month a different speaker took this half-hour service. The Anglican contributor was the Bishop of Croydon, perhaps the most successful modern religious broadcaster. Canon McNarney represented the Roman Catholics and the Free Church speakers were Dr Townley Lord, President of the Baptist World Alliance, and the well-known Presbyterian minister, the Rev. Tom Allan. What these sermons lack in dignity they make up in relevance to the needs and outlook of the average man. Minor points of criticism could be made, like the use of slang and the habit of splitting up even a short sermon into two parts; but these are small matters compared with the complete grasp shown by these preachers of the problem of communication and their success in speaking in the language and idiom of the ordinary man to-day. They must have made an impact on those who heard them and in print they are still fresh and arresting.

GRAHAM SANSBURY.

SKEGNESS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ABINGDON PRESS: E. M. Howse, *Spiritual Values in Shakespeare* ($2.50).

BLACKWELL: Joachim Jeremias (translated by A. Ehrhardt), *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* [see review of the German original in THEOLOGY, January 1950, pp. 33f., by R. Gregor Smith] (18s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: W. Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation* (25s.).

DOUBLEDAY (NEW YORK): James A. Pike, *Doing the Truth: a summary of Christian Ethics* ($2.95).

EDINBURGH HOUSE PRESS: Dewi Morgan, *Korea—what of the Church?* (1s.).

EDITIONS DU SEUIL (PARIS): Henri de Lubac, *Amida* (960 frs.).

HIGHWAY PRESS: Douglas Webster, *What is a Missionary?* (2s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Cecil Hunt, *This Shining Day* (8s. 6d.); Simone Saint-Clair, *The Heart Aflame* (10s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Charles S. Duthie, *God in His World* (8s. 6d.).

MIRFIELD PUBLICATIONS: E. K. Talbot, C.R., *A Preaching of the Cross* (3s.).

REINHARDT (MUNICH): F. Heiler and others, *Das Sakrament der kirchlichen Einheit: Ökumenische Aufsätze über das Abendmahl* (DM 6.80).

S.C.M. PRESS: J. S. Thomson, *The Hope of the Gospel* (10s. 6d.); C. A. Pierce, *Conscience in the New Testament* (8s. 6d.); Ethelbert Stauffer, *Christ and the Caesars* (18s.); M. A. C. Warren, *The Gospel of Victory* (7s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON